



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/562,733 | 12/30/2005 | Marc-Edouard Irigoyen | 2937-131 | 7737 |

6449 7590 11/13/2008
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.
1425 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

WENDELL, MARK R

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

3635

| | |
|-------------------|---------------|
| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-------------------|---------------|

11/13/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/562,733 | Applicant(s) IRIGOYEN, MARC-EDOUARD | |
| | Examiner MARK R. WENDELL | Art Unit 3635 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's arguments filed 10/10/2008 have been reviewed and the finality of the action dated 6/10/2008 has been removed. A subsequent non-final office action is provided below since additional prior art was found.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 11-14, 16-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thompson et al. (US 5337531). Regarding claim 11, Thompson illustrates in Figures 1, 2 and 4 a beam attachment system (20) comprising:

- Two posts (92 of Figure 4, the examiner notes that it would be inherent that a second post similar to the one illustrated in Figure 4 would be provided at the other end);
- A beam (12);
- At least one beam tie (28) in which:
 - The posts (92) are stressed by the beam (12) to push them apart and stressed by the beam tie (28) to pull them together (The

Art Unit: 3635

examiner notes that the posts would be inherently stressed by the beam to push them apart and the beam ties would inherently be provided to keep them from falling over by applying an equal and opposite force to pull them together. The examiner notes that any horizontal beam being placed between and in contact with two vertical beams exerts an outward, repelling force or stress to the vertical beams thus pushing them apart. The mere fact that there is a horizontal beam between two vertical beams within the reference justifies the examiners inherency grounds.);

- The beam being connected to the beam tie (see Figure 4); and
- The beam and the beam tie being mounted sliding relative to each other according to a finite sliding portion (44) (Also, the examiner notes to see columns 3 and 4 for further discussion).

Regarding claim 12, Thompson illustrates in Figure 2 sleeves (nuts, 50) mounted on the beam tie (28) thus delimiting the finite sliding portion (44). The examiner also notes that column 4, lines 1-10 note that the nuts are meant to keep tube 44 from sliding around and they also allow for sliding adjustment of the finite sliding portion.

Regarding claim 13, Thompson illustrates in Figure 4 the beam comprising lateral parts between which the beam tie passage is formed. The examiner notes that in Figure 4 it

Art Unit: 3635

is illustrated that the beam tie passes through the beam to be attached, via the bolt, to post (92).

Regarding claim 14, Thompson illustrates in Figure 4 the beam being supported by the beam tie. The examiner further notes that in column 3, lines 20-55 the prior art teaches that beam (12) is supported by a major support structure (20) which comprising columns (22) and the beam tie (28).

Regarding claim 16, Thompson illustrates in Figure 4 the post being connected to the beam by means of a connecting rod (bolt, which connects 14, 28, 72 and 92 to one another).

Regarding claim 17, Thompson illustrates in Figure 4 the existence of posts, which are on the edge of the support structure.

Regarding claim 19, Thompson illustrates in Figure 1 each of the beam ties (28) being single beam ties.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 3635

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson et al. (US 5337531). It is described above what is disclosed by Thompson; however the reference does not distinctly disclose the exact material of the beam (12). The examiner notes that the prior art does discuss the entire structure being a truss. It is well known in the building construction art that trusses can be made of steel or wood (see the other publications section of the Thompson prior art). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to make the beam of steel, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice (In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416).

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson et al. (US 5337531) in view of Gleeson (US 4353190). It is described above what is disclosed by Thompson; however the reference does not distinctly disclose the beam being several longitudinal segments. Gleeson illustrates in Figures 2-7 the upper truss beam being several longitudinal segments. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the upper beam (12) of Thompson be several segments rather than one continuous beam and attach the segments together in the center at the center beam (22) in order to decrease the weight of each beam structure which would make for easier installation. The examiner notes

Art Unit: 3635

that the Thompson prior art states in column 7 that various modifications and variations may be made in the trusses without departing from the scope, which happens to be to provide a lightweight truss structure.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Arguments, filed 10/10/2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 11-19 under 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Thompson and Gleeson.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARK R. WENDELL whose telephone number is (571)270-3245. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 7:30AM-5PM, Alt. Fri off, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Chilcot can be reached on (571) 272-6777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3635

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Richard E. Chilcot, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3635

/M. R. W./
Examiner, Art Unit 3635
November 5, 2008